



Re: EPA Releases Third Set of Sampling Results for Dimock Wells
Rubinkam, Michael to: Roy Seneca
Cc: Terri-A White

04/20/2012 03:58 PM

From: "Rubinkam, Michael" <mrubinkam@ap.org>
To: Roy Seneca/R3/USEPA/US@EPA,
Cc: Terri-A White/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
History: This message has been replied to.

I'm sorry for being dense, but the first part of the statement clearly implies the test results were basically fine: "This set of sampling did not show levels of contaminants that would give EPA reason to take further action." But it sounds like that is not true — there was a high level of arsenic contamination in one well, prompting EPA to offer water. So EPA DID take further action. It's just that the resident declined the offer.

So would it be accurate to say that one of the 16 wells turned up an elevated level of arsenic, but none of the other 15 had contaminant levels that exceeded primary or second MCLs? What was the arsenic level in the one well? The site to which you link has a file with 617 pages of data. I have no idea which of the 16 wells are included in this third announcement of test results.

Thank you.

Michael Rubinkam | Northeastern Pa. correspondent



Work: 610-530-5791
Email: mrubinkam@ap.org
Twitter: [michaelrubinkam](https://twitter.com/michaelrubinkam)
From: "Seneca.Roy@epamail.epa.gov" <Seneca.Roy@epamail.epa.gov>
Date: Fri, 20 Apr 2012 15:49:20 -0400
To: Associated Press <mrubinkam@ap.org>
Cc: Terri-A White <White.Terri-A@epamail.epa.gov>
Subject: Re: EPA Releases Third Set of Sampling Results for Dimock Wells

As noted in our statement, we offered alternative water to one resident and the resident declined. There is no need to take further action.

Roy Seneca
EPA Region 3 Press Officer
Office of Public Affairs
seneca.roy@epa.gov
(215) 814-5567

From: "Rubinkam, Michael" <mrubinkam@ap.org>
To: Terri-A White/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Roy Seneca/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 04/20/2012 03:27 PM
Subject: Re: EPA Releases Third Set of Sampling Results for Dimock Wells

Also:
You say the sampling did not show levels of contaminants that would give EPA reason to take further action. In the next sentence, you say EPA found elevated levels of arsenic. These two statements seem to contradict one another. Please explain.
Thanks,
Mike

Michael Rubinkam | Northeastern Pa. correspondent



Work: 610-530-5791
Email: mrubinkam@ap.org
Twitter: [michaelrubinkam](https://twitter.com/michaelrubinkam)

From: Terri-A White <White.Terri-A@epamail.epa.gov>
Date: Fri, 20 Apr 2012 15:16:51 -0400
Cc: <seneca.roy@epa.gov>, Terri-A White <White.Terri-A@epamail.epa.gov>
Subject: EPA Releases Third Set of Sampling Results for Dimock Wells

EPA 4/20/12 Statement on Dimock:

EPA has completed and shared with residents and Pennsylvania state officials the third set of sampling at 16 private drinking water wells in Dimock, Pennsylvania. This set of sampling did not show levels of contaminants that would give EPA reason to take further action. At one well, EPA found elevated levels of arsenic and offered alternate water but the resident declined. EPA remains committed to providing Dimock residents with the best available data and information on the quality of drinking water as expeditiously as possible.

For more information on the sampling results, visit: <http://www.epa.gov/aboutepa/states/pa.html>

The information contained in this communication is intended for the use of the designated recipients named above. If the reader of this communication is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this communication in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify The Associated Press immediately by telephone at +1-212-621-1898

and delete this email. Thank you.
[IP_US_DISC]

msk dccc60c6d2c3a6438f0cf467d9a4938